

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/688,501	10/16/2000	Shridhar P. Joshi	47079-00077	3225	
30223	7590 07/11/2006	•	EXAM	EXAMINER	
JENKENS & GILCHRIST, P.C. 225 WEST WASHINGTON					
SUITE 2600 CHICAGO, 1			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
o, .	2 0000		DATE MAILED: 07/11/2006	5	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notification of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief (37 CFR 41.37)

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/688,501	JOSHI, SHRIDHAR P.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Alex P. Rada	3712		

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on	11 May 2006 is defective	e for failure to comply wit	in one or more provis	ions of 37 CFR-41.37.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file anamended brief or other appropriate correction (see MPEP 1205.03) within ONE MONTH or THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.

1. 🗌	The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 41.37(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. 🗌	The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, (e.g., rejected, allowed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled), or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iii)).
3. 🗌	At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(iv)).
4.	(a) The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters; and/or (b) the brief fails to: (1) identify, for each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately, every means plus function and step plus function under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, and/or (2) set forth the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawings, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(v)).
5. 🗌	The brief does not contain a concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vi))
6. 🛛	The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each ground of rejection on appeal (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(vii)).
7.	The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(viii)).
8. 🗌	The brief does not contain copies of the evidence submitted under 37 CFR 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal , along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered by the examiner, as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(ix)).
9. 🗌	The brief does not contain copies of the decisions rendered by a court or the Board in the proceeding identified in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of the brief as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 41.37(c)(1)(x)).
10.🛛	Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):
or a sing	gle ground of rejection, Appellant is required to argue all the claims together or, if Appellant wishes to argue some claims

For a single ground of rejection, Appellant is required to argue all the claims together or, if Appellant wishes to argue some claims separately, Appellant must show why the claims are separately patentable. Merely arguing that the claims contain additional limitations is not considered a valid showing of separate patentability. Appeallant has argued claims separately without showing why they are

separaetely patentable. Therefore the appeal breief is improper.

JOHN M. HOTALING, II PRIMARY EXAMINER